

## REMARKS

The present application was filed on September 1, 2000 with claims 1-48. Claims 1, 33, 37 and 46 are the original independent claims.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-18, 20, 21, 23-28, 32-35, 37-41, 45 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,842,453 to Kloth et al. (hereinafter "Kloth").

Claims 3, 10, 19, 22 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kloth.

Claims 29-31, 42-44, 47 and 48 are indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

With respect to the §112 rejection of claim 17, the claim has been amended in a manner which is believed to overcome the rejection.

With regard to the §102(e) and §103(a) rejections, Applicants respectfully traverse on the ground that the Kloth reference fails to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of independent claims 1, 33, 37 and 46 as originally filed. For example, with regard to independent claim 1 as originally filed, it is believed that Kloth fails to teach or suggest at least a first list of frame groups as recited in the claim. Similarly, it is believed that Kloth fails to teach or suggest at least the plurality of lists of groups of frames as recited in claim 33, and a table which lists groups of frames as recited in claim 37.

Notwithstanding the traversal, Applicants have amended the claims. It is respectfully submitted that the claim amendments are not made for purposes of patentability relative to Kloth or other prior art of record, but are instead made solely in order to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of dependent claims 26 and 28, both now canceled. The claim as amended now recites that the first list of frame groups is one of a plurality of lists of frame groups including at least one additional list of frame groups different than the first list of frame groups, wherein one or more frame parameters defining the groups of the at least one additional list are not the same parameters as the plurality of frame parameters which define the groups of the first list. The claim further recites that the acceleration

switch compares the received frames to one of the first or at least one additional lists. Adjustments have been made in the dependencies of claims 29-31.


Independent claim 33 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of dependent claims 34 and 36, both now canceled. The claim as amended now recites that providing the plurality of lists comprises providing lists which use different sets of parameters in defining groups of frames, and that comparing at least one of the received frames to at least one of the plurality of lists comprises determining to which of the at least one of the plurality of lists to compare each frame responsive to the value of one or more fields of the frame.

Independent claim 37 has been canceled. Dependent claim 42 has been rewritten in independent form, incorporating the limitations of claim 37 and dependent claim 41, the latter also being canceled. Adjustments have been made in the dependencies of claims 38-40. Claim 42 as amended is believed to be in condition for allowance, in view of the above indication of allowable subject matter.

Independent claim 46 has been canceled. Dependent claims 47 and 48 have been rewritten in independent form, each incorporating the limitations of claim 46, and are believed to be in condition for allowance based on the above indication of allowable subject matter.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that the claims as amended are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: July 7, 2005

Joseph B. Ryan  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 37,922  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
90 Forest Avenue  
Locust Valley, NY 11560  
(516) 759-7517